

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 5, 6 and 9 are all the claims pending in the application. Claims 1, 2, 5, 6 and 9 presently stand rejected.

As an initial matter, the Examiner has not acknowledged the claim for foreign priority. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner acknowledge the claim for foreign priority and confirm receipt of the priority document in the parent application.

Moreover, a typographical error in independent claim 5 has been corrected.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102 and §103

Claims 1, 2, 5 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kobayashi (JP 7-161392) in view of Livshiz et al. (2001/0016459). Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kobayashi (JP 7-161392) in view of Livshiz et al. (2001/0016459) and further in view of Ikeno et al. (5,045,527).

With respect to independent claims 1 and 5, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection at least because there is not combination of Kobayashi and Livshiz that would reasonably teach or suggest all of the claim's recitations. For example, there is not combination of Kobayashi and Livshiz that would reasonably teach or suggest the claimed structure or method in which the diameter of a wire connection portion is uniformly reduced over an entire periphery and an entire length of the wire connection portion.

The Examiner alleges that Kobayashi discloses a wire connection portion that is uniformly reduced over an *entire length* of the connection portion. However, as previously asserted, Kobayashi does not disclose that a wire connection is uniformly reduced over an entire

length of the connection portion. In fact, Kobayashi merely discloses that the compression terminal 10 for the cable conductor is compressed and connected to the cable conductor 3A by hydraulic pressure pressing.¹ Hydraulic pressing is generally used for connecting this kind of pressing machine. A terminal pressing machine is a normal pressing machine which cannot compress the terminal so as to uniformly reduce the wire connection portion.

In addition, the Examiner acknowledges that Kobayashi does not disclose that the wire connection portion is pressed radially over both an entire periphery and an entire length of the wire connection portion. Therefore, the Examiner looks to Livshiz's wire connection in an attempt to make up for this deficiency.

Livshiz discloses a tubular portion 25 and conductive fibers 30 disposed within the tubular portion. When the tubular portion 25 (wire connecting portion) is placed within a magnetic forming coil 46, the tubular portion 25 is pressed radially by a magnetic force so that the diameter of the tubular portion is reduced. *See* Livshiz at Figs. 2-6 and 85.

With respect to independent claims 1 and 5, it appears to be the Examiner's position that Livshiz discloses a structure in which the diameter of the wire connection portion is *uniformly* reduced over an *entire periphery and an entire length* of the wire connection portion.

However, Applicant believes that the Examiner's position is based on a misapprehension of Livshiz. The apparatus 40 of Livshiz cannot press a wire connection portion so that its diameter is uniformly reduced over an entire periphery and an entire length thereof because the shape of the forming coil 46 is not provided at a uniform distance around the assembly 52.

¹ *See* Kobayashi at para. 11.

Instead, the coils is U-shaped with a gap.² The non-uniform shape of the forming coil produces a non-uniform electrically generated compressing force.

As such, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of independent claims 1 and 5. Moreover, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of dependent claims 2 and 6 at least because of their dependency from claims 1 and 5, respectively.

Finally, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of dependent claim 9 at least because of its dependency from claim 1 and because Ikeno, which was cited by the Examiner as showing a rotary swaging machine, does not cure the deficiencies in the combination of Kobayashi and Livshiz discussed above.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

² See Livshiz at Fig. 6.

Amendment under 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
Appln. No. 10/775,203

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.


Respectfully submitted,

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER



John M. Bird
Registration No. 46,027

Date: April 21, 2005